UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/831,600	05/11/2001	Jouni Kivela	0365-0501P	5717
	7590 01/13/201 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747	CH 374 22040 0747	CHEUNG, WILLIAM K		
FALLS CHURG	CH, VA 22040-0747	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1796		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/13/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/831,600	KIVELA ET AL.	
English and	A 4 11 14	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	WILLIAM K. CHEUNG	1796	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 30 December 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affida eal (with appeal fee) in complianc	vit, or other evidence, w e with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set fort ater than SIX MONTHS from the maili b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN Th	ng date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amour hortened statutory period for reply ori than three months after the mailing d	t of the fee. The appropria ginally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)),	o avoid dismissal of the	
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I  (a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo  (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see N0 w);	OTE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).		
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li> </ol>		,	,
non-allowable claim(s).  7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)	·	•	_
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .  Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .  Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3,4,7-25,29 and 31-34</u> .  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under app	eal and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10.  ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application	in condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/William K Cheung/		
	Primary Examiner, Art January 6, 2010	Unit 1796	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment for independent claims 1, 13, 14, 29, 35, "a gas is returned into the gas phase reactor at a point above the level of the fluidized bed", and "recovered lumps are withdrawn from a collecting vessel throug a second outlet nozzle" introduces new issues that would require further consideration and/or search by the examiner.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In view of new issues, the proposed amendment has not been entered. Therefore, claims 1, 3, 4, 7-25, 29, and 31-34 stand rejected for the reasons adequately set forth from the final rejection of July 30, 2009. Regarding applicants' argument that the claimed invention is different from the one disclosed in Bernier et al. because Bernier et al. do not teach a process that is carried in both continuously and discontinuously at the same time, the examiner disagrees because nothing in Bernier et al. requires Bernier et al. to run the process with outlets running all continuously or intermittently (discontinuously). In view that there are only two choices (continuous or discontinuous) for each of the outlets, the examiner has a reasonable basis to believe that the rationale set forth for the rejection is adequate. Regarding applicants' argument that the outlet nozzle of Bernier et al. is not connected to the reactor as claimed, the argument is not supported by the claims as written; the claims only require "at the same level as the fluidized bed". In view of the reasons set forth above, the rejections set forth in the final rejection of July 30, 2009 are proper.